

REMARKS

Status of Application

Claims 1-11 were pending in this application. In the Office Action mailed January 5, 2009, claims 1-11 were rejected.

By this amendment, claims 1-11 are pending as currently amended, and claim 12 is new. No new matter is introduced by these amendments, which are fully supported by the specification.

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-12.

Applicant reserves the right to prosecute any withdrawn, cancelled, or non-elected claims and/or subject matter in separate applications.

Objections to Drawings

The drawings were objected to because they contain reference characters 101 and 201 which are described in the text as being “pixels,” “electronic units,” and “detector elements.” Applicants respectfully suggest that the drawings are correct in that the specification is clear that “pixels” and “detector elements” are embodiments of “electronic units.” The term “electronic units” is defined in the specification. (See Applicants’ specification at page 2, line 12, page 4, lines 17-28, claims 6, 7 and 11, and Abstract, line 2)

Accordingly, as required by M.P.E.P. § 608.02(V), the same part of Applicant’s invention is designated by the same reference characters, and the same reference characters are not used to designate different parts. Thus, these objections can be withdrawn.

Objections to Specification

Applicants herein submit an amended abstract as requested.

Applicant respectfully declines to add headings to the specification as these are not required in accordance with MPEP § 608.01(a).

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-9 and 11 were rejected as anticipated by Uchino et al., U.S. Pat. Publ. No. 2003-0038795. In brief, among other things, the Examiner stated that, in regard to claim 4, that Uchino et al. show “equally large groups in which the electronic units are each disposed in a similar way,” as well as other features of Applicants’ claims 1-9 and 11.

Applicants’ respectfully submit that claims 1-12 as amended clarify the scope of the claimed invention with respect to the groups of electronic units being “An array arrangement comprising two or more groups of associated electronic units,” wherein “each group of associated electronic units” is comprising “one external trigger line and an addressing circuit.” Claims 1-12 as amended are patentably distinct from Uchino et al. who do not disclose “an array arrangement comprising two or more groups of associated electronic units” as claimed by Applicants. Thus, these rejections can be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claim 10 was rejected as unpatentable over Uchino et al. in view of “Applicant Admitted Prior Art.” The Examiner stated that Uchino et al. discloses “all the limitations of claim 1” from which claim 10 depends. Applicants respectfully submit that Uchino et al. do not disclose or suggest all the limitations of claim 1 as amended, as discussed above. Thus, this rejection can be withdrawn.

In conclusion, claims 1-12 are patentable over the cited references, either alone or in any combination.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-12 as amended distinguish patentably from the references of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-12.

Should any questions remain, Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard R. Eckman/

Richard R. Eckman

Reg. No. 42,504

Attorney for Applicant

For Christopher M. Ries, Reg. No. 45,799

Philips Intellectual Property and Standards

345 Scarborough Road

Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001 USA

Telephone: 914-333-9632